

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,471	07/17/2003	Kinya Kodama	240485US0	9185
22850	7590 06/02/2005		EXAM	INER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			BERMAN, SUSAN W	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1711	
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2009	5.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/620,471	KODAMA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Susan W. Berman	1711					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ref f NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.						
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ T	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
	·						
closed in accordance with the practice unde	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>9-24</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	 ☐ Claim(s) 9-24 is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	nccepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4\ ☐ Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/IIII) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No.	Summary (P10-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 					

Office Action Summary

Ze

Response to Amendment

The rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (5,457,003 or equivalent JP 04-338958 or equivalent EP 466025) is withdrawn because Tanaka et al do not teach or suggest an optical waveguide formed of the disclosed composition.

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-8 as being anticipated by Toyoda et al (6,537,723) is withdrawn. Toyoda et al disclose compositions for forming optical waveguides comprising a silicone oligomer of formula 2 and a photolithographic method for forming a waveguide. However, it is agreed that the disclosed silicone oligomer does not correspond to the instantly claimed organosilicone structure.

A new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the amendment to recite an optical waveguide and the disclosure of Ghoshal et al cited herein below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghoshal et al (6,832,036, filed 10/11/2002). Ghoshal et al disclose siloxane optical waveguides from radiation curable siloxane resin compositions wherein the radiation curable functional groups can be ethylenically

unsaturated or epoxides (column 2, line 25, to column 3, line 52). See examples of "FG" in columns 5-6, column 7, lines 56-62, column 8, line 57, to column 9, line 3, column 11, lines 12-18, Example 1, column 18, lines 30-32, column 20, line 62, to column 21, line 11. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to select siloxane containing epoxide functional groups from the siloxanes disclosed by Ghoshal et al. The reasons is that Ghoshal et al teach either ethylenically unsaturated groups or epoxide groups and include examples wherein the functional groups are epoxide groups. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation of providing siloxane optical waveguides having the very low optical losses and compatibility with silicon processing requirements taught by Ghoshal et al.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sekiguchi et al (6,207,728) is cited as art of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan W Berman whose telephone number is 571 272 1067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/620,471 Page 4

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan W Berman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711

SB 5/30/2005